

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,914	10/24/2005	Takiko Nakada	0388-050243	1001
28289 THE WEBB I	7590 02/17/2010 AW FIRM, P.C.	EXAMINER		
700 KOPPERS	S BUILDING	HYLTON, ROBIN ANNETTE		
436 SEVENTI PITTSBURGE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3781	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/17/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/525,914	NAKADA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ROBIN HYLTON	3781	

Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	ROBIN HYLTON	3781					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If No period for reply is generally assume the maining date of the communication	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a repty be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Je 2a)□ This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is				
Disposition of Claims							
4) ◯ Claim(s) 14-22 and 27-29 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) ◯ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ◯ Claim(s) 14-22 and 27-29 is/are rejected. 7) ◯ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ◯ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the lidrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	a 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☒ All b b ☐ some * c ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document: 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents: 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SBiO8) Paper No(s)Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ite					

Art Unit: 3781

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

 The indicated allowability of the claims is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Yaniger (US 6,153,275). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Omum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Application/Control Number: 10/525,914

Art Unit: 3781

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 14-22, and 27-29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim of copending Application No. 10/588,593. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both disclose a stopper comprising a core formed of an elastic material and having a liquid-contact surface and an outer peripheral surface continuous with the liquid-contact surface, the liquid-contact surface and the outer peripheral surface being coated with a skin made of a synthetic resin; wherein said skin is a polyester skin made of a polyester resin or a synthetic resin having a polyester resin as a main component thereof, and the polyester skin is bonded to the liquid-contact surface and the outer peripheral surface of said core through a polyethylene bonding layer formed of a polyethylene resin or having a polyethylene resin as a main component thereof. The co-pending application further sets forth the thickness of the layers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to set froth the thicknesses of the layers as in the co-pending applicant.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/525,914

Art Unit: 3781

 Claims 14-22 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanioer (US 6.153.275).

Yaniger discloses a stopper comprising a core of elastic material and coated with a skin of synthetic material, including a bonding layer. Yaniger is silent regarding a core-side adhesion forming layer and a skin-side adhesion forming layer. The method of fusion the bonding layer renders the claim a product-by-process claim.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a bonding layer having a core-side adhesion forming layer and a skin-side adhesion forming layer and to use thermal fusion to join the skin, core and bonding layer together. Doing so provides an alternative plug having a securely bonded layers.

Conclusion

- 6. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear Issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 2163.06 II(A), MPEP 2163.06 and MPEP 714.02. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.
- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Various prior art closures teaching features similar to those disclosed and/or claimed are cited for their disclosures.
- 8. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720/80 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (571) 273-8300. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 3720/80 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Art Unit: 3781

9. It is called to applicant's attention that if a communication is faxed before the reply time has expired, applicant may submit the reply with a "Certificate of Facsimile" which merely asserts that the reply is being faxed on a given date. So faxed, before the period for reply has expired, the reply may be considered timely. A suggested format for a certificate follows:
I hereby certify that this correspondence for Application Serial No is being facsimiled The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via fax number 571-273-8300 on the date shown below:
Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate
Signature
Date

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robin Hylton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4540. The examiner can normally be reached Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Stashick, can be reached on (571) 272-4561.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Other helpful telephone numbers are listed for applicant's benefit:

- Allowed Files & Publication (888) 786-0101
 - Assignment Branch (800) 972-6382
 - Certificates of Correction (703) 305-8309
 - Fee Questions (571) 272-6400
 - Inventor Assistance Center (800) PTO-9199
 - Petitions/special Programs (571) 272-3282
 - Information Help line 1-800-786-9199
- Internet PTO-Home Page http://www.uspto.gov

February 12, 2010

/Robin A. Hylton/ Robin A. Hylton Primary Examiner GAU 3781